

Appn. No.: 10/766,319
Amendment dated September 29, 2006
Reply to Office Action of June 29, 2006

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 4-6, 12 and 13. These sheets, which include Figs. 4-6, 12 and 13, replace the original sheets including Figs. 4-6, 12 and 13. In Figs. 4, 5, 6 and 12, previously omitted elements 402, 510, 606 and 1208 have been added, respectively. In Fig. 13, step 1308 has been corrected to comport with the detailed description by replacing "parent" with --current--.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The office action of June 29, 2006 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 10-12 remain pending in this application. Claims 1-9 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and new claims 13-18 have been added.

The drawings and specification stand objected to for failing to identify reference numerals in the drawings that are described in the specification or, alternatively, for failing to include reference numerals in the specification that are identified in the drawings. The drawings and specification have been amended herein. In addition, the specification has been amended to correct minor informalities and grammatical errors. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-3, 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. publication 2003/0117378 to “Carro”. Claim 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carro in view of U.S. patent 5,983,215 to Ross et al. (“Ross”). Claims 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carro in view of either U.S. publication 2005/0154993 to Chen et al. (“Chen”) or in view of U.S. publication 2004/0119762 to Denoue et al. (“Denoue”). Notwithstanding the merits of these rejections, they have been rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 1-9.

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 6,762,777 to “Carroll”. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 10 has been substantially amended and clearly differentiates from Carroll in a number of respects. Amended claim 10 includes, among other features, receiving a selection of a region of web page content displayed in an on-screen region of a display, determining a window associated with the selected region; attempting to retrieve an application interface having a URI property from the window, and in response to successfully retrieving an application interface having a URI property, storing the URI property of the window as context information. Notably, Carroll lacks a teaching or suggestion of the claim 10 feature of receiving a selection of a region of *web page content*. In contrast to determining a window *associated* with the selected region as recited in claim 10, Carroll associates a popup window with a selected region of a document. Moreover, Carroll is wholly devoid of a teaching or suggestion of attempting to retrieve *an application interface having a URI property* from the window as called for in claim 10.

In view of the aforementioned reasons, claim 10 is patentably distinct from Carroll. Claim 11, which depends from claim 10, is also distinguishable from Carroll for the same reasons as claim 10, and further in view of the additional advantageous features recited therein.

Claim 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 7,042,594 to Dawe et al. ("Dawe"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As amended, claim 12 calls for, among other features determining if the bounding box of the text is within the selected region, and if the bounding box is determined to be within the selected region, storing as context information actual text including the text within the selected region. The action contends that Dawe shows all the elements of claim 12. However, since Dawe indicates that a bounding box may be drawn around a selected region, Dawe obviously does not contemplate, teach or suggest the claim 12 features of determining if the bounding box is *within* the selected region, and if the bounding box is determined to be within the selected region, storing as context information actual text including the text within the selected region. For at least these reasons, claim 12 is patentably distinct from Dawe.

New claims 13-19 are fully supported by the specification and believed to be allowable over the art of record.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: September 29, 2006

By: /Gary D. Fedorochko/
Gary D. Fedorochko
Registration No. 35,509

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001
GDF:lab




Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure 6

Appln. No.: 10/766,319
Amendment dated September 29, 2006
Reply to Office Action of June 29, 2006
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes




Figure 12

